



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_44456
Title of the Manuscript:	DESIGN, FABRICATION AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF FISH FEED PELLETIZING MACHINE FOR LOW INCOME FARMERS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Picture of the fabricated machine should be included in the manuscript 2. Total feed per year is more than and not close to (Line 29) 3. Check through the manuscript for the different referencing styles; In (Line 32-35), The reference came after the quoted text (Worldfish centre, 2005) while in (line 41), the reference came before the quoted text (Anyadine et al (2014)) 4. What is the standard feed formula (Line 92) 5. Bad arrangement of the references! They should be in alphabetical order (Lines 149-169) 6. There's no reference to previous works done on this machine or is it that there is no literature on previous works done 7. What is the source of power for the machine? In line 62, 'the screw conveyor is powered by an electric motor or petrol engine'! Which was used for this work? 8. In line 83, 'Locally available materials were used to reduce cost' but stainless steel is more expensive than mild steel. Why was locally available materials used? 	Thank you for your comments. Necessary corrections have been done.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why do we need fish feeds in pellets? 2. What are pellets and in what shape do they exist? Are they in a single shape only? 3. Pelletising or Pelletizing? (Lines 15 and 45) 4. Different fonts between (Lines 41 – 55) 5. Paper fails to describe properly new design and the difference between the current fabricated machines and the new one. 6. It talks about efficiency of the fabricated machine and about simplifying the already machine, but actually does not mention the efficiency of existing fabricated machine, it also fails to describe the machine and changes 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments •	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The paper has been substantially modified and improved.• However, in my opinion it still requires some improvements.• The paper structure, its concept, language, figures, calculations have an acceptable level.	
---------------------------------------	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	